

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Alice Felder-Lucas,

Plaintiff,

v.

Dave Hunter, CEO, in his personal  
capacity, against his bond; Irene Dorner,  
CEO, in her personal capacity, against her  
bond; County Assessor Elizabeth M.  
McDonald; Janette McBride, County Clerk  
of Court; Sheriff Leon Lott; John C.  
Dugan, Comptroller of Currency; Michael  
S. Piwowar, Security Exchange  
Commissioner; SEC Headquarters;  
Secretary of State Mark Hammond; James  
Ransom, Accredited Home Lenders, Inc.;  
Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems,  
Inc., Corporate Headquarters; Caliber  
Home Loans; H.S.B.C. Mortgage Services,  
Inc.; Brock & Scout, PLLC; Suzanne E.  
Brown, SC Bar #76440; Rogers,  
Townsend, & Thomas, PC; Kevin T.  
Brown, SCB #064236; Equifax; Experian;  
Transunion; John/Jane Does #1-20; and  
Kara M. Stein, all defendants in their  
personal capacity, in their official capacity,  
against their oath, against their fiduciary  
responsibility bond,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 3:17-cv-2327-TLW

**ORDER**

On August 30, 2017, Plaintiff Alice Felder-Lucas, (“Plaintiff”) brought this action, *pro se*, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 seeking monetary damages and injunctive relief. ECF No. 1. Plaintiff then filed a Motion for Temporary Restraining Order on September 7, 2017. ECF No. 7.

This matter now comes before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (the Report) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2),

(D.S.C.). ECF No. 11. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Complaint be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance of service of process pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Objections were due on September 27, 2017, however, Plaintiff failed to file objections to the Report.

This Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that Report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Report and relevant filings. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 11, is **ACCEPTED**, and this Complaint is **DISMISSED** pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3) and 42 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. As a result, Plaintiff's Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and Hearing, ECF No. 7, is rendered **MOOT**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
Chief United States District Judge

June 5, 2018  
Columbia, South Carolina